



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PRONOMINAL ROOTS.

BY PROF. A. J. MAAS, S. J.,

Woodstock, Md.

Pronouns are nouns expressing the more common general relations in language (cf. Fürst, *Aram. Idioms*, § 190.; and Olshausen, *Lehrbuch*, n. 94). They may be reduced to four classes,—demonstrative, relative, indefinite and interrogative pronouns. Grammarians usually treat of these as of correlative words. I shall first, therefore, say a word on the connection of correlatives; secondly, give a table of their roots; thirdly, apply the given roots to the four classes of pronouns, beginning with the most emphatic demonstratives, the personal pronouns.

I. CONNECTION OF CORRELATIVES.

Correlatives embrace demonstrative, relative, indefinite and interrogative pronouns and particles. These four classes are easily reduced to two,—the one containing the demonstrative and relative pronouns; the other, the indefinite and interrogative. Apollonius (*Animadv. ad vet. gramm. doct. de artic.*, p. 20 ed. Lips.) points out a twofold demonstration,—*δείξιν τῆς ὁψευδούς* and *δείξιν τοῦ νοῦ*, i. e. an ocular and a mental one. The particle employed in the former is now called demonstrative, while the word that points forward to what we are going to say, or back to what we have said, is called relative. Originally the same word served as demonstrative and relative, as is still evident in the Latin particle “ce” which appears in both “hi-c” and “qui—” (cf. Schoemanni, *Quæst. Gramm.*, c. 1., Gryphiswald, 1865, p. 5 sq.).

The second class of correlatives embraces the indefinite and interrogative particles. These two were identical in the beginning, and are so still in many cases. Compare, for instance, the Greek *τις, πότερος, ποσος, ποιος, πηλικος, που, ποθεν, ποι, ποτε, πως, πη*, the Latin *quis*, etc. Only the accent and the inflection of voice indicate whether these particles are employed as indefinite or as interrogative. Language is perfectly logical in identifying the interrogative and indefinite particles. For a question supposes a state of indefinite and imperfect knowledge in the inquirer. Nobody can ask about what he is absolutely ignorant. “*Ignoti nulla cupido*,” as the old Scholastics used to say. On the other hand, the human mind is inquisitive by nature, or, as Seneca said, “*Natura curiosum nobis ingenium dedit*,” and consequently we are naturally inclined to inquire about what we but imperfectly know. Inquiry and indefinite knowledge being naturally connected,

we must be prepared to see this connection expressed in the particles employed to manifest that state of mind. And if we consider that all language is demonstrative, we rightly name the indefinite particles indefinite demonstratives.

All particles, then, were originally either definite or indefinite demonstratives. Apollonius may again serve as our guide. He distinguishes τὴν πλῆσιον and τὴν πόρρω δειξιν, and would no doubt have identified his divisions with our definite and indefinite demonstration. It is difficult, however, to determine the exact limit between the πλῆσιον and the πόρρω δειξίς, and language had to grapple with this difficulty in the concrete. Like Alexander, it cut the Gordian knot without untying it. The same particle was used for both definite and indefinite demonstration, accent and inflection of voice serving again as distinguishing characteristics. A parallel instance may be seen in the use of the German definite article, where emphasis and context decide whether *der* is article, or relative, or demonstrative. Cf. Schoemann in the passage cited above.

II. TABLE OF SEMITIC PRONOMINAL ROOTS.

	COMPARE				
	Sanscrit	Latin	Greek	Gothic	German and English
1. אֲנִי-אָנִי-אֵנִי	i-dam, ah	is—e-go	ἐ-γώ	ik	ich—I
2. הוּא-הִיא-הֵן	yas, yau, ye	hi-c	ὁ, ὅς	jus	ihr—who, he
3. זֶה-זֵּה-זֵּי	sá, sas	sui, ip-se	δεῖνα(?), σὺ	sik, sis	sich—
4. כֵּן-כִּי-כֵן	kas, kau, ke	-ce, qui	ἐ-κεῖνος	ik	kein, ich
5. מִי-מִי-מִי	mat	me, ego-met	ἐ-μεῖς, ἐ-μέ	mik	mich—me
6. נָנוּ-נִי-נָנוּ	nas	nos, ne	νῶ	uns	uns
7. פֶּה-פִּי-פֶּה	api	ip-se	σφός		
8. תָּו-תִּי-תָּו	twat, tat	tu, is-te	τὸς, τὴν, τις	thu	der, dieser—this, that

The Sanscrit, Latin, Greek, Gothic, English and German pronominal forms I merely suggest as comparisons, without asserting their absolute identity with the respective Semitic particles. The manner in which they combine, however, will be indirectly suggested in treating of the composition of the Semitic pronouns.

III. ANALYSIS OF SEMITIC PRONOUNS.

I begin with an analysis of the personal pronoun, because it is the most emphatic and definite demonstrative. The following table contains the component elements of only the Hebrew personal pronoun; but the peculiarities of the personal pronouns in the various Semitic dialects will be given below.

Singular	Plural
אֲנִי = אַן + הַא + כִּי	אַנְחֵנוּ = אַן + הַא + נוּ
אַתָּה = אַן + תַּא + הַא or אַן + תַּה	אַתֶּם = אַן + תַּוּ + מַא
אֵת = אַן + תִּי	אַתֶּן = אַן + תַּוּ + נַא
הוּא = אַן + הוּ + אַה	הֵם = אַן + הוּ + מַא
הֵיא = אַן + הִי + אַה	הֵן = אַן + הוּ + נַא

According to this table all pronominal forms are preceded by the particle אַן. That this was originally the case even in the pronoun of the third person singular and plural is plain from the corresponding Aramaic forms, אַנְהוּ, אַנְהִי, אַנְוּ, אַנְוִי, etc. The rejection of initial אַן has its analogy in Syriac, when the personal pronoun serves as copula or accompanies the act. participle. Thus ^{אֲנִי} ^{אֲנִי} reads "omarno;" ^{אֲנִי} ^{אֲנִי} reads "iliditun" (cf. Merx, *Gramm. Syriaca*, p. 108 seq.). The third person may thus have lost its initial אַן even in writing, on account of its frequent occurrence in phrases where אַן was omitted in pronunciation.

אַן may be compared to the Latin "en", the Hebrew הֵן, and the Arabic ^{أَنَّ}. It is a particle that draws the attention of the hearer to what is going to follow. The Syriac ^{أَنَّ}, Arabic ^{أَنَّ}, Mand. אַנַּא, Chald. אַנַּא, Samarit. אַנַּא and Ethiopic ^{አን} are nothing but אַן + הַא, i. e. *en eum* (cf. the Lat. *ecum*). The Hebrew אַנְכִּי and Assyrian an â ku consist of the elements אַן-הַא-כוּ, i. e. *en hi-c*. ה changes not unfrequently into quiescent ך or ך'. Thus we have בּוֹשׁ besides Chald. בְּהַת, דּוֹר besides Arabic ^{دور} and מוֹל, מְהַל and נוֹר, נְהַל (cf. Gesenius, *Lexic.*, under ה). The Hebrew אַנִּי may be explained as אַן-אִי or אַן-הִי,

The second person singular masculine explains itself in almost all Semitic dialects. Its component elements are distinctly traceable in Arab. ^{أَنْتَ}, Chald. אַנְתָּה or אַנְתִּי, Mand. אַנַּת, and Syr. ^{אַנְתָּ}; the Ethiopic form too tells its own story ^{አንተ}. In Heb. אַתָּה and Assyrian atta the ך of אַן has suffered assimilation. The *linea occultans* of the Syriac ^{ܐܢܬܐ} indicates the same assimilation at least in pronunciation. The second person feminine singular differs from the masculine only by its termination, the final vowel vanishing entirely or attenuating to hîreq. But the characteristics of gender terminations will be treated later on.

The third person has rejected its initial אַן in all dialects except the Chaldee.

The Assyrian šû and ši must be derived from הו and הי . הוּא and היא have their equivalents in هُوَ and هِيَ , while in Syriac ܘܗܝ and ܘܗܘ the final element has disappeared. The Mandarin 何 and 何 , Samaritan 𐤇𐤅 and 𐤇𐤆 and 𐤇𐤍 and Ethiopic ወ and ሀ offer no special difficulty.

In the plural forms the radical terminations ם and ן are characteristic, the former in the masculine gender and the latter in the feminine. If we look upon the plural as an indefinite state of the noun, the plural terminations may be regarded as indefinite particles. We may compare the use of *tenween* in Arabic (cf. Lansing, *Arab. Man.*, Special Preface, p. x). This hint must suffice here. The plural terminations will be spoken of again when we come to the indefinite demonstratives.

אֲנִי then consists of אֶן-הָא-נו , the middle element being transformed into ה . Changes of ה into ח occur frequently enough to justify our conjecture. Thus we have הוּא and חוא , הוּן and חוּן , גֶּהֱ and גֶּחַ (cf. Gesenius, *Lexicon*, under ה). In נָחֵנוּ the initial א is rejected. אֲנִי is either a shortened form of אֲנִיחָנוּ , the medial elements having been rejected, or a derived form of אֶן-הָנו , Arabic نَحْنُ , Syriac ܢܗܝܢ and ܢܗܝܢ , Chaldee ܐܢܝܚܢܐ and ܢܚܢܐ , Ethiopic ነከነ and Samarit. 𐤍𐤅𐤍 and 𐤍𐤅𐤍 . In Assy. (a)nini and Mand. אֲנִי medial ה has been changed to quiescent ׀ , a well-known process, while in Chald. אֲנִי the guttural element is elided.

[To be continued.]